

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 13-20. By way of the present amendment, claims 1, 4 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice, claims 2, 5 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form, claim 7 has been amended to change its dependency to claim 2, and new claim 21 has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objected to the disclosure for the following informalities:

On page 11, line 18, “second layer 12” should be – second layer 11--; and

On page 12, line 1, “stepped surfaces 11” should be – stepped surfaces 12--.

Applicants have made the appropriate correction.

Applicants have also amended paragraph 43 of the specification and claim 10 to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Claims Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 7-12.

Without acquiescing to the Examiner’s rejections, Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 4 and 12 to move the remaining claims to issuance.

Applicants have amended claim 7 to change its dependency, and claim 8-11 by virtue of their dependency upon claim 7, to claim 2.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 13-20 as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 5, 6-11 and 13-15, Applicants have rewritten claims 2, 5 and 13 in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 depends from claim 2, claim 6 depends from claim 5 and claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. By this amendment, claim 7 depends from claim 2, claim 8 from claim 7, claim 9 from claim 8, claim 10 from claim 9, and claim 11 from claim 10. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-3, 5-11 and 13-15 are allowable.

Regarding claims 16-20, the Examiner allowed these claims on page 9 of the Office Action. In addition, claim 16 is already written in independent form and claims 17-20 depend from claim 16. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objection to claims 16-20 was in error and that these claims are allowable.

New Claim 21

New claim 21 is fully supported, for example, on page 20, lines 9-13 of the specification, and depends from allowed claim 16.


CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the application with the presently pending claims 2, 3, 5, 6-11 and 13-21. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (949) 567-6700, Ext. 7760, if the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview would advance this case to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: July 31, 2003

By: 
Kenneth S. Roberts
Reg. No. 38,283

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, California 92614-2558
(949) 567-6700